

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2020

by Stephen Wilkinson BA BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3246662

191 Brunswick Park Road, London, N11

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Bradley Pattemore against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/3149/HSE, dated 1 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is a double storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have determined the application on basis of the proposed scheme being for a 'first floor side extension with associated alterations to the roof', as this description would appear to be accepted by both parties and to my mind more accurately describes the form of development sought. Accordingly, I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Procedural Matters

4. There is a dispute between the parties on the accuracy of the submitted plans regarding the position of the neighbouring property in relation to the property boundary. I have taken the location of the neighbouring property into account and determined the appeal based on findings from my site visit.

Reasons

5. The western side of Brunswick Park Road comprises pairs of semi-detached residential properties regularly spaced by shared drives serving garages and providing access to rear gardens. Their regular spacing is accentuated by hipped gable roofs which despite several of these being developed into gables contribute to the open character of this part of the streetscene.
6. The neighbouring property, No.193 Brunswick Park Road, has a 2 storey flank extension set close to the boundary with the appeal site. The proposed first floor side extension located above the existing side extension would be on this boundary. Despite the splay between the 2 properties the resultant gap of

about 1m would be of insufficient width to maintain the essential character of the streetscene at this point. This is despite the inclusion in the design of a hipped roof gable and the extension's slight set back from the frontage. The proposal would have the effect of creating the appearance of a terrace rather than maintaining the properties as distinct pairs of semi-detached properties. This would undermine the character and appearance of the streetscene at this point.

7. Although the appeal scheme before me, would result in a form of development broadly similar to that allowed on appeal¹ at the neighbouring property, the 2 schemes can be distinguished by their cumulative impact which would diminish the gap between the two properties at first floor level adversely affecting the established character of this part of the road.
8. Underpinning policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) and policies CS05 and DM01 of the Local Plan is a presumption that development should enhance local character and respect the appearance, scale and pattern of surrounding buildings. Furthermore, the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) requires new development to be sympathetic to local character. I conclude that the proposed scheme would result in a form of development which would not comply with these policies resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene. For this reason, I hereby dismiss this appeal.

Stephen Wilkinson

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/N5090/A/07/2052882